



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/728,783	11/30/2000	Jurgen Pingel	P-4582	2695

7590 06/26/2003

Forrest Gunnison
Gunnison, McKay & Hodgson, L.L.P.
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Monterey, CA 93940

EXAMINER

WONG, LESLIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 06/26/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/728,783

Applicant(s)

PINGEL ET AL.

Examiner

Leslie Wong

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3 and 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2177

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "250" in Fig. 2 has been used to designate both "datafile" and "Doc. file". A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-19, and 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lawrence et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,289,342 B1) in view of **Kanerva et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,507,858 B1).

Regarding claims 1, 12, 15, and 22, **Lawrence et al.** teaches a method, computer program, and storage medium for creating a reference database for a computer-readable document comprising:

a). entering inputted reference data into the reference database (col. 6, lines 42-52); and,

Art Unit: 2177

b). storing the reference database and other data of the computer-readable document (col. 8, lines 12-17).

Lawrence et al. does not explicitly teach a step of storing the **reference database and other data** of the computer-readable document in a **single data file**.

Kanerva et al., however, teaches a step of storing, viewing, editing, and processing ordered sections having **differing file formats in a compound document** (col. 3, lines 23-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to store document related data in the same file because doing so would ensure that reference data is always available for access.

Regarding claims 2, 16, and 23, **Lawrence et al.** further teaches wherein the computer readable document further comprises a reference field for retrieving a record stored in the reference database (col. 6, lines 45-52).

Regarding claims 3 and 17, **Lawrence et al.** further teaches wherein the reference database further comprises:

- a). fields for different types of reference data sources (col. 8, lines 11-17); and
- b). fields containing specific information associated with these different types of reference data sources (col. 8, lines 11-17).

Art Unit: 2177

Regarding claims 4 and 18, **Lawrence et al.** further teaches wherein the reference database comprises a bibliographic database, and the reference data sources comprise books, journals, conference presentations, web-pages and e-mails (col. 5, line 65 – col. 6, line 40).

Regarding claims 5 and 19, **Lawrence et al.** further teaches wherein the reference database further comprises one field containing information about a number of citations of a reference in the document (col. 15, tables 2-4).

Regarding claims 7 and 24, **Kanerva et al.**, further teaches a step of synchronizing the reference database with other data sources (col. 22, lines 20-49 and Fig. 6A).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to allow synchronizing the reference data with other data sources in order to reconcile the differences between sources and to assure that the stored information is up-to-date.

Regarding claim 8, **Lawrence et al.** further teaches wherein said method is stored in a storage medium (col. 8, lines 49-50).

Regarding claim 9, **Lawrence et al.** further teaches wherein said method is downloaded into said storage medium (col. 4, lines 8-11 and col. 8, lines 49-50).

Regarding claim 10, **Lawrence et al.** further teaches an apparatus for creating a reference database for a computer-readable document comprising:

- a). a processor (Fig. 1); and
- b). a storage medium coupled to said processor (elements 16 and 24 in Fig. 1).
- c). a reference database (col. 4, lines 8-11 and col. 6, lines 45-50).

Lawrence et al. does not explicitly teach a step including a reference database together with a document in a single data file.

Kanerva et al., however, teaches a step of storing, viewing, editing, and processing ordered sections having differing file formats in a compound document (col. 3, lines 23-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to store document related data in the same file because doing so would ensure that reference data is always available for access.

Regarding claim 11, **Lawrence et al.** further teaches wherein said processor is in a first device, and said storage medium is in a second device (col. 8, lines 21-28).

Regarding claim 13, **Lawrence et al.** further teaches wherein the computer-readable document further comprises reference fields (col. 8, lines 11-17).

Regarding claim 14, **Lawrence et al.** further teaches wherein the reference database contains fields for different types of reference data sources and fields containing specific information associated with these data sources (col. 8, lines 11-17).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Lawrence et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,289,342 B1) in view of **Kanerva et al.** (U.S. Patent 6,507,858 B1) as applied to claims 1-5, 7-19, and 22-24 above and further in view of **Nurse et al.** (U.S. Patent 5,097,418).

Regarding claims 6 and 20, **Lawrence et al. and Kanerva et al.**, do not clearly teach a step of displaying a user interactive dialogue window for inputting reference data.

Nurse et al., however, teaches a step of displaying a user interactive dialogue window for inputting reference data (col. 3, line 50 – col. 4, line 7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to allow users to input reference data into the database in order to accumulate information from several sources (col. 3, lines 45-46).

Regarding claim 21, **Kanerva et al.**, further teaches a step of synchronizing the reference database with other data sources (col. 22, lines 20-49 and Fig. 6A).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to allow synchronizing the reference data with other data sources in order to reconcile the differences between sources and to assure that the stored information is up-to-date.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Konrad (U.S. Patent 5,544,320).

Husick et al. (U.S. Patent 5,675,788)

Taylor (U.S. Patent 6,209,004 B1)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (703) 305-3018. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 746-7239 for regular communications and (703) 746-7238 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2177

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Leslie Wong
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2177

lw
June 15, 2003



JEAN R. HOMERE
PRIMARY EXAMINER